

## **Message# 310\_10-27-2024 – In the Beginning**

Preached first on 10/27/2024 on [www.molibertyradio.us](http://www.molibertyradio.us)

Good morning everyone. Thank you for tuning into the message this morning.

At the end of last week's message, I was getting ready to read some of Samuel Birley Rowbotham's book, Zetetic Astronomy, Earth Not a Globe! As I did with the other work that I had been reading, I wanted to read to you from the Conclusion chapter. And that's what I intend on doing today. Mainly because there's a lot more approach from the Bible, in the Conclusion. Before I start, though, I want to say a few things about concerning why I wanted to read this to you.

Please listen very closely. As I have stated many times in this series - I have an open bias. I'm not hiding my bias, I'm not hiding my perspective. My perspective has been - wide open - clearly stated - at least that what my intention has been - that I believe the Bible is the inspired Word of God. It was given to us as a Guide book, a Rule book, a Lawbook and within our Bibles - we find everything we need to find about how the God of Creation wants His created ones to live - us. The Bible tells us how we are supposed to live. The Bible tells us God created the heaven and the earth - the world. The Bible tells us that God established Laws. God established right and wrong, good and evil - and man is only allowed to live according to those definitions of right and wrong, good and evil. Man is not allowed to make up his own definitions - his own "laws" - and then force others to abide by his definitions.

Think about this for just a minute. You've been living where you live for a while. You've farmed your land. You've got your routine. You have your way of life. And, as you understand things, you've done all you can do to live by your understandings of the Bible and things that please God. Then, one day, someone moves into your area. Say a mile down the road. You don't know this guy. Never met him. You know nothing about him. And as soon as he moves in, he starts making "laws." And he shows up at your place one day and starts looking around at the way you live and he says - "You are breaking my laws. I have a set of laws that I have made and I expect everyone around here to live according to those laws - and - you aren't - so - out of the kindness of my heart - I'm going to give you 10 days to start conforming to these laws that I have established - but if you don't - I'm going to come back and take you to jail - take your land - and give it to the highest bidder."

Well, if that happened to you, you'd think that was the craziest thing you'd ever heard.

More than likely - if you were a real, red-blooded man - you'd get really mad - probably mad enough to prepare yourself for some kind of a fight - if this stranger came back in 10 days - threatening to take you off your land - take your land and home away from you - because you refused to conform to his new "laws" that he established - not just for himself - but for all of his neighbors.

As crazy as that whole little fable I created sounds, that is exactly what mankind does and what people allow. People let total strangers come up with all these definitions of right and wrong, good and evil - they call them "laws" - and then the people allow those "laws" to be forced onto them - at gunpoint - through threats of taking their bodies to jail or taking their land and homes away - and hardly anyone has a problem with it.

God said man is not allowed to do things like this to another man. Men are not allowed to assemble themselves - to create "government" - for the purpose of making their own "laws" and forcing others to obey them. Especially on men who have made the choice - they have chosen this day, or that day, or some day - they have chosen to exclusively obey the very few handful of Laws that God established. A man has chosen to live by the very few Laws of God - he's raised his family - he's worked his land - his lived his whole life according to the Laws of God - now someone comes along and says, "Your ways, your customs, the Laws of your God are no longer valid, you now must submit to everything we decide is the right way or the wrong way to live your life from now on."

What's a man supposed to do under such circumstances? Does he just give in? Does he just bow down and give up everything he knew to be the way to live according to the Bible? "My conscience tells me that I am supposed to live exclusively according to the Laws of God. My study of the Bible tells me that I am not supposed to be a citizen of worldly nations, but rather a Citizen of the Commonwealth of Israel" and all of a sudden I am supposed to abandon my conscience - and listen now - live my life according to someone else's conscience?"

The vast majority of people in the world believe that God said - all of my Creation is supposed to live according to the "majority's opinions. Whichever side of an issue the majority of the people vote for, that's how you are supposed to live your life - no matter if the majority's opinions are opposite of what the Bible says." That's the world we live in. If voting in men's little g "governments" was legitimate - that's the way it works. It's majority rule. Whatever the majority says, that's what God says, is the way people are supposed to live.

Well friends, I reject that. I reject that totally, completely. Why? Because the Bible, what I have studied from the Bible tells me that my main purpose in life - is to obey God and keep His Commandments. I believe the Bible. I believe the Bible is the Word of God.

That's my bias. That's my perspective. While I have been in this series, "In the beginning" - my purpose has been to show what the Bible says about the world, the Creation of the world. I've looked for things from the Bible that give us clues as to how things work in God's Creation. For instance, and I have gone to this often, mainly because it's easy. It is very easy to show from the Bible, that God said it is the sun that moves, and the world is still. It is very easy to show from the Bible that the moon is a light source. It is easy to show from the Bible that the stars are near and they very small - as opposed to so far away that by the time we see their light in the sky - most of them have already burned up millions, billions, or trillions of years ago.

Last week, I made the statement that it's "insanity" to believe in the scientist's theory of lightspeed. I stand by that statement. Why? Because a man cannot believe what the Bible says - and believe in NASA's theory of lightspeed - especially as it relates to the distance and size of the stars.

I believe if you asked a thousand people who claim to believe NASA's theories - if you asked them to tell you exactly what those theories are - there's probably not one out of that thousand that could actually tell you what it is they are supposed to believe. I have rejected NASA's theory of lightspeed for several reasons. The first reason, the easiest reason, in my opinion, is because their theory of lightspeed concludes that most of the stars are...from their own words, this is from NASA's website.

<https://spaceplace.nasa.gov/sun-compare/en/#:~:text=The%20size%20of%20our%20sun&text=There%20are%20bigger%20stars%2C%20and,the%20size%20of%20our%20sun.>

*Our Sun is a bright, hot ball of hydrogen and helium at the center of our solar system. It is 864,000 miles (1,392,000 km) in diameter, which makes it 109 times wider than Earth. It's 10,000 degrees Fahrenheit (5,500 degrees Celsius) at the surface, and 27 million degrees Fahrenheit (15,000,000 degrees Celsius) in the core. Yikes!*

Really? How do they know that? Have they been there? How do they know it's a hot ball of hydrogen and helium? So, it's burning right? The hydrogen and helium, are they the gases that are burning to make those temperatures? Why is not burning out? How

does it keep generating the hydrogen and the helium to keep it burning? Will it ever burn out? Continues.

*Our Sun is pretty impressive, but how does it compare to other stars? There are billions more stars in the Milky Way galaxy - the galaxy we call home. And there are many, many more in the rest of the universe. Is our Sun special?*

*The size of our sun*

*It turns out that our Sun is an average sized star. There are bigger stars, and there are smaller stars. We have found stars that are 100 times bigger in diameter than our sun. Truly, those stars are enormous. We have also seen stars that are just one tenth the size of our sun. End quote.*

These statements cause me - as a Christian - as a follower of Jesus Christ - as a believer in the Word of God - these statements cause me to stand up - in the face of a world of ridicule - if so, so be it - and say, "This cannot be true. In the very first chapter of the Bible that God told whoever wrote that chapter - God said - write this:

[14] And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years:

[15] And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so.

[16] And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also.

[17] And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth,

[18] And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good.

Beginning then with Genesis chapter 15 and going all the way through to the end of the Book of Revelation, those two lights are called the Sun and the Moon. The sun, the moon, and the stars. All throughout the Book, that is what they are called. And in Genesis chapter one, God said, the Creator said, He made two great lights - the sun and the moon. The word great comes from the Hebrew gawdole (and we've talked about this before) and it means of magnitude and extent. Size. There are no stars, there are no lights that God Created, that are bigger than the sun and the moon. That's what the Bible says.

When I was reading to you last week from the source stating the Bible is a Flat-Earth Book, as he was citing the book of Enoch, I thought it was interesting that he omitted something from the book of Enoch that I have found to be particularly noteworthy. And it is that Section 3, chapter 72 says the sun and the moon are the same size. I did a Google search and typed in “are the sun and the moon the same size.” And, just realized this week, that the Google answers are now called AI Overview. And, the AI Overview says that it is just “Cosmic Coincidence” that the sun and the moon look to be the same size from our viewpoint. Not that I believe the book of Enoch is God-inspired, I don't know what I believe about that at this point, but in Section 3, Chapter 72, the book of Enoch says:

[https://www.ccel.org/c/charles/otpseudepig/enoch/ENOCH\\_3.HTM](https://www.ccel.org/c/charles/otpseudepig/enoch/ENOCH_3.HTM)

*On that day the night decreases and amounts to nine parts, and the day to nine parts, and the night [33] is equal to the day and the year is exactly as to its days three hundred and sixty-four. And the length of the day and of the night, and the shortness of the day and of the night arise-through the course [34] of the sun these distinctions are made (lit. ' they are separated '). So it comes that its course becomes [35] daily longer, and its course nightly shorter. And this is the law and the course of the sun, and his return as often as he returns sixty times and rises, i.e. the great luminary which is named the sun, for ever and ever. And that which (thus) rises is the great luminary, and is so named according to [37] its appearance, according as the Lord commanded. As he rises, so he sets and decreases not, and rests not, but runs day and night, and his light is sevenfold brighter than that of the moon; but as regards size they are both equal. End quote.*

Our Bible, at least the way I read it in Genesis chapter 1, does not necessarily say that the sun and the moon are the same size. But it does refer to them as “great lights” - and - I believe it is meant to be understood that the stars are lesser - in size.

Alright, back to my bias and perspective. Openly admitting, openly saying so that hopefully no one can misunderstand - I believe the Bible to be true - and anything that does not agree with the Bible - to be false. I believe that what is written in the Bible - is what God meant for us to understand. Even with the obvious manmade corruptions - like “church” and “baptism” - I believe that we can see, we will be led into the truth of the Bible - even with man's corruptions. We'll find them out, we'll know what they are. So, I have, absolutely I have - I'm telling you this - I have researched people who say they base their belief systems - and in this series, particularly - they have based their

belief systems on the Bible. And, that is what I have produced in this series.

I'm not going to apologize for it. When I see NASA teaching the Big Bang theory. When I see NASA teaching lightspeed, light-years, when I see that NASA does not teach the Bible, when NASA's teachings oppose the Bible - then I'm not going to them to have them teach me the things I should believe about the world. I'm taking the Bible and those that teach the Bible - pretty much - every single time.

But what about "Answers in Genesis? Aren't they teaching the Bible?" Yes. They are quoting Bible verses. And I am happy every time I see the Bible quoted. But - and I realize the word "but" typically means - forget what I just said, this is what I really mean - when someone believes in men's little g "governments" - when someone doesn't even understand 501(c)(3) corporations and who created them and for what purpose - then I am going to be very careful about the conclusions they come to when they present Scripture. I have read "Answers in Genesis" official position that the Bible teaches a "spinning ball earth". But what I found was basically a reformulated teaching that tries to force the Bible into a NASA book. Their teaching on Isaiah 40:22 was as shallow as anything I've ever read from the "churchmen." And Isaiah 40:22 is supposedly one of their strong points in advocating from the NASA position.

501(c)(3) corporations risk their corporate status if they go too strongly against public policy. And NASA is certainly public policy.

I believe, and I have stated this many times, not just in this series, but for several years now, I believe that the Bible does not teach a "spinning ball world". In this series, I have looked for others who also do not believe in a "spinning ball world". I may not agree with everything they say, but if they are teaching that the world is not a "spinning ball", and they are presenting Scripture as their proof - then - that is what I have presented.

I found some people saying some pretty shady things about Samuel Rowbotham. I have no idea whether those things were true or not. I can't even say with 100% certainty that Samuel Rowbotham was even a real man. I think that he was. I think that his book has survived since the 1800s. Regardless, what is contained in his book, in my opinion, most of it is really good. In his book, which I absolutely recommend for people to read, he explains, from his perspective, from his study and some of his own tests his own experiments, he explains these things in their own chapter:

<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/69892/69892-h/69892-h.htm>

*SECTION I.*

*Introduction—Experiments proving the Earth to be a Plane.*

*SECTION II.*

*The Earth no Axial or Orbital Motion.*

*SECTION III.*

*The true distance of the Sun and Stars.*

*SECTION IV.*

*The Sun moves in a Circle over the Earth, concentric with the North Pole.*

*SECTION V.*

*Diameter of Sun's path constantly changing.*

*SECTION VI.*

*Cause of Day and Night, Seasons, &c.*

*SECTION VII.*

*Cause of "Sun rise" and "Sun set."*

*SECTION VIII.*

*Cause of Sun appearing larger when "Arising" and "Setting" than when on the Meridian.*

*SECTION IX.[iv]*

*Cause of Solar and Lunar Eclipses.*

*SECTION X.*

*Cause of Tides.*

*SECTION XI.*

*Constitution, Condition, and ultimate Destruction of the Earth by Fire.*

And of course, this is one thing that I certainly would not agree with.

*SECTION XII.*

*Miscellanea—Moon's Phases—Moon's appearance—Planet Neptune—Pendulum Experiments as Proofs of Earth's motion.*

*SECTION XIII.*

*Perspective on the Sea.*

*SECTION XIV.*

*General Summary—Application—"Cui Bono."*

For those who want answers to their questions concerning eclipses, the tides, the seasons, etc., the man provides answers - and he does so from the perspective that he believes the Bible does not teach a "spinning ball world". When he presents his beliefs in his book, his arguments are really really good. The man was way smarter than I'll

ever be on those subjects. Apparently, he started studying those things and was fascinated by all of it before he even reached the age of 10. He apparently devoted his whole life to understanding the eclipses and tides, stars, etc., and his perspective was that he believed the Bible was the Word of God and the things that were recorded there are what God wanted people to know about His Creation. On that basis - I can recommend that people who have just accepted NASA's teachings on the eclipses, etc., and as a result - have rejected the clear teachings of things in the Bible - such as the non-spinning, non-rotating world - I submit to you that you have only heard half the story. If you take NASA's teachings on eclipses, etc., and then conclude that the Bible is wrong - and I've had people say that to me in this series - you are basing your belief on only one teaching - and not only that - but you are basing your belief system from something that is Anti-Christ, Anti-God in every level of its existence.

Again, I think I said this last week, if not, I know I have at some point, but NASA's budget is more than 60 million "dollars" per day. Where is that money coming from? It is coming from the u.s. "government." And where is that money coming from? Is it coming from people that just freely give to them? Are the people in the u.s. just happily giving away their hard-earned money - or is it coming from "taxes?" Taxation is theft. Taking from one person and just giving to another is theft. It doesn't matter if the man who just moves into the neighborhood and starts making his own "laws" and starts demanding that his neighbors pay him taxes and fees - and he gets away with it because he calls himself "the government" - it's theft. Plain and simple. It's theft.

And just because the majority agrees to it, or the majority votes for it, or the congressmen and senators votes for it - it doesn't change what it is. All these "government" agencies - get their funding through theft. Thou shalt not steal. One of the very few, tiny amount of Laws that God established - and they can't even keep one of them. Yet, we are supposed to ignore the fact that they are built on theft, they are built on breaking one of God's most important Laws - and we are supposed to believe what they say about the origins of the world.

Their purpose is to make people doubt the existence of God. If there is no God. There is no Law of God. If there is no Law of God - then thou shalt not steal is either invalid - or it becomes a sliding scale. Thou shalt not steal - unless you call yourself "government." Thou shalt not steal - unless you can get enough people to agree that thou shalt not steal doesn't apply equally to everyone.

I've been accused of making NASA out to be a "straw man". Then, because NASA is a



strawman - I can argue against everything that NASA says. If that's the perception, then let me clear it up - again. I did this early on in this series. It is God Who is the One who invented the ad hominem attack. It is God Who said, "The fool has said in his heart, there is no God." So. Guilty. Only thing is, what I have said about NASA, about Neil DeGrasse-Tyson, about Carl Sagan - none of that is "straw". I've used their own words. I've provided their own websites. I've provided their own teachings. Then, I've compared those things to what the Bible says. And what they say, and what the Bible says - are not in agreement. The Bible says, "In the beginning God." The scientists say, "There is no God." I'll take the Bible 7 days a week, and twice on the 7<sup>th</sup> day.

The "scientists" say - if there is no God, then what is there?" And their answer is: "It's just us." And there you have the justification for men making their own laws, their own definitions of good and evil, right and wrong, their own code of morality - which - unless you have your head buried somewhere - you see man's code of morality opposing God's in every single respect. Thou shalt not kill. Unless the "government" deems it necessary - as in - the taking of someone else's oil, or land. Thou shalt not kill. Unless it is after x number of days after conception. Thou shalt not steal. Unless the "government" says it wants someone else's property to give to someone else.

Carl Sagan's simple conclusion: "It's just us." Is exactly what men's little g "governments" want people to believe. And that is exactly what they have done. It is man's "government" and God's Government does not exist.

I may decide to read more from Rowbotham's Earth Not a Globe! - but here is the final chapter.

The link to an online version is in the notes.

<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/69892/69892-h/69892-h.htm>

The book is titled:

ZETETIC ASTRONOMY.  
EARTH NOT A GLOBE!  
AN EXPERIMENTAL INQUIRY  
INTO THE  
TRUE FIGURE OF THE EARTH:  
PROVING IT A PLANE,  
WITHOUT AXIAL OR ORBITAL MOTION;

AND THE  
ONLY MATERIAL WORLD  
IN  
THE UNIVERSE!

BY "PARALLAX."

London:  
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO., STATIONERS' HALL COURT.  
Bath:  
S. HAYWARD, GREEN STREET.  
1865.

[The Right of Translation is Reserved by the Author.]

#### *GENERAL SUMMARY—APPLICATION—CUI BONO?*

[Cui bono?, in English "to whom is it a benefit?", is a Latin phrase about identifying crime suspects. It depends on the fact that crimes are often committed to benefit their perpetrators; especially financially. That's what he named this general summary chapter.]

*In the preceding sections it has been shown that the Copernican, or Newtonian theory of Astronomy [those are from where the spinning ball earth theory came] is "an absurd composition of truth and error;" and, as admitted by its founder, "not necessarily true or even probable," End quote.*

[That quote attributed to Nicholas Copernicus is easily found. As is the following from his book:]

[https://www.geo.utexas.edu/courses/302d/Fall\\_2011/Full%20text%20-%20Nicholas%20Copernicus,%20\\_De%20Revolutionibus%20\(On%20the%20Revolutions\),\\_%201.pdf](https://www.geo.utexas.edu/courses/302d/Fall_2011/Full%20text%20-%20Nicholas%20Copernicus,%20_De%20Revolutionibus%20(On%20the%20Revolutions),_%201.pdf)

#### *NICHOLAS COPERNICUS OF TORUŃ*

##### *SIX BOOKS ON THE REVOLUTIONS OF THE HEAVENLY SPHERES*

*Diligent reader, in this work, which has just been created and published, you have the motions of the fixed stars and planets, as these motions have been reconstituted on the basis of ancient as well as recent observations, and have moreover been embellished by new and marvelous hypotheses.*

*You also have most convenient tables, from which you will be able to compute those motions with the utmost ease for any time whatever. Therefore buy, read, and enjoy [this work]. Let no one untrained in geometry enter here. End quote.*

And, I want to remind you again of Paul's warning concerning the elements of the world - in which Mr. Thayer said Paul was referencing Euclidean geometry. Copernicus said with his charts and with a knowledge of geometry - all the computations you would ever need work - and they'd work for anytime. Funny thing is, I've shown several times in this series alone how NASA and their "scientists" and "astronomers" have claimed to come up with all sorts of computations that have changed - and have changed dramatically. Interesting how that works. You can make numbers do pretty much anything you want them to do. Continuing with Rowbotham.

*and that instead of its being a general conclusion derived from known and admitted facts, it is a heterogeneous compound of assumed premises, isolated truths, and variable appearances in nature. Its advocates are challenged to show a single instance wherein a phenomenon is explained, a calculation made, or a conclusion advanced without the aid of an avowed or implied assumption! The very construction of a theory at all, and especially such as the Copernican, is a complete violation of that natural and legitimate mode of investigation to which the term zetetic has been applied. The doctrine of the universality of gravitation is an assumption, made only in accordance[177] with that "pride and ambition which has led philosophers to think it beneath them to offer anything less to the world than a complete and finished system of nature." It was said, in effect, by Newton, and has ever since been insisted upon by his disciples—"Allow us, without proof, the existence of two universal forces—centrifugal and centripetal, or attraction and repulsion, and we will construct a system which shall explain all the leading mysteries of nature. An apple falling from a tree, or a stone rolling downwards, and a pail of water tied to a string set in rapid motion were assumed to be types of the relations existing among all the bodies in the universe. The moon was assumed to have a tendency to fall towards the Earth, and the Earth and Moon together towards the Sun. The same relation was assumed to exist between all the smaller and larger luminaries in the firmament; and it soon became necessary to extend this assumption to infinity. The universe was parcelled out into systems—co-existent and illimitable. Suns, Planets, Satellites, and Comets were assumed to exist, infinite in number and boundless in extent; and to enable the theorists to explain the alternating and constantly recurring phenomena which were everywhere observable, these numberless and for-ever-extending objects were assumed to be spheres. The Earth[178] we inhabit was called a planet; and because it was thought to be reasonable*

*that the luminous objects in the firmament which were called planets were spherical and had motion, so it was only reasonable to suppose that as the Earth was a planet it must also be spherical and have motion—ergo, the Earth is a globe, and moves upon axes and in an orbit round the Sun! And as the Earth is a globe, and is inhabited, so again it is only reasonable to conclude that the planets are worlds like the Earth, and are inhabited by sentient beings! What reasoning! Assumption upon assumption, and the conclusion derived therefrom called a thing proved, to be employed as a truth to substantiate the first assumption! Such a “juggle and jumble” of fancies and falsehoods, extended and intensified as it is in theoretical astronomy, is calculated to make the unprejudiced inquirer revolt in horror from the terrible conjuration which has been practised upon him; to sternly resolve to resist its further progress; to endeavour to overthrow the entire edifice, and to bury in its ruins the false honours which have been associated with its fabricators, and which still attach to its devotees. For the learning, the patience, the perseverance, and devotion for which they have ever been examples, honour and applause need not be withheld; but their false reasoning, the advantages they have[179] taken of the general ignorance of mankind in respect to astronomical subjects, and the unfounded theories they have advanced and defended, cannot but be regretted, and ought to be resisted. It has become a duty, paramount and imperative, to meet them in open, avowed, and unyielding rebellion; to declare that their unopposed reign of error and confusion is over; and that henceforth, like a falling dynasty, they must shrink and disappear, leaving the throne and the kingdom to those awakening intellects whose numbers are constantly increasing, and whose march is rapid and irresistible. The soldiers of truth and reason have drawn the sword, and ere another generation has been educated, will have forced the usurper to abdicate. The axe is lifted—it is falling, and in a very few years will have “cut the cumberer down.” The Earth a Globe, and it is necessarily demanded that it has a diurnal and an annual and various other motions; for a globular world without motion would be useless—day and night, winter and summer, the half year’s light and darkness at the “North Pole,” and other phenomena could not be explained by the supposition of rotundity without the assumption also of rapid and constant motion. Hence it is assumed that the Earth and Moon, and all the Planets[180] and their Satellites move in relation to each other, and that the whole move together in different planes round the Sun. The Sun and its “system” of revolving bodies are now assumed to have a general and all-inclusive motion, in common with an endless series of other Suns and systems, around some other and “central Sun” which has been assumed to be the true axis and centre of the Universe! These assumed general motions with the particular and peculiar motions which are assigned to the various bodies in detail, together constitute a system so confused and complicated that it is almost impossible and always difficult of*

*comprehension by the most active and devoted minds.*

[See Neil DeGrasse-Tyson's answer to: What is Gravity? “We have no idea, next question.”]

*The most simple and direct experiments, however, may be shown to prove that the Earth has no progressive motion whatever; and here again the advocates of this interminable and entangling arrangement are challenged to produce a single instance of so called proofs of these motions which does not involve an assumption—often a glaring falsehood—but always a point which is not, or cannot be demonstrated.*

*The magnitudes, distances, velocities, and periodic times which these assumed motions eliminate, are all glaringly fictitious, because they are only such as a false theory creates a necessity for. It is geometrically demonstrable[181] that all the visible luminaries in the firmament are within a distance of a few thousand miles, not more than the space which stretches between the North Pole and the Cape of Good Hope; and the principle of measurement—that of plane triangulation—which demonstrates this important fact, is one which no mathematician, demanding to be considered a master in the science, dare for a moment deny. All these luminaries then, and the Sun itself, being so near to us, cannot be other than very small as compared with the Earth we inhabit. They are all in motion over the Earth, which is alone immovable, and therefore they cannot be anything more than secondary and subservient structures, ministering to this fixed material world, and to its inhabitants. This is a plain, simple, and in every respect demonstrable philosophy, agreeing with the evidence of our senses, borne out by every fairly instituted experiment, and never requiring a violation of those principles of investigation which the human mind has ever recognized, and depended upon in its every day life. The modern, or Newtonian Astronomy, has none of these characteristics. The whole system taken together constitutes a most monstrous absurdity. It is false in its foundation; irregular, unfair, and illogical in its details; and in its conclusions inconsistent and contradictory. Worse than all,[182] it is a prolific source of irreligion and of atheism, of which its advocates are, practically, supporters! By defending a system which is directly opposite to that which is taught in connection with all religions, they lead the more critical and daring intellects to reject the scriptures altogether, to ignore the worship, and doubt and deny the existence of a Supreme Ruler of the world. End quote.*

Wow. Friends, I have not said the things I have said - not just in this series - but for my entire adult life - that denying the Bible leads to denying God and then ultimately

denying His Laws and denying God as the Supreme Ruler of the world. His statement here is awesome. I believe it is exactly what I've been trying to say to people for a very long time. Listen again.

*Worse than all,[182] [talking about the Newtonian theories] it is a prolific source of irreligion and of atheism, of which its advocates are, practically, supporters! By defending a system which is directly opposite to that which is taught in connection with all religions, they lead the more critical and daring intellects to reject the scriptures altogether, to ignore the worship, and doubt and deny the existence of a Supreme Ruler of the world.*

*Many of the primest minds are thus irreparably injured, robbed of those present pleasures, and that cheering hope of the future which the earnest christian devotee holds as of far greater value than all earthly wealth and grandeur; or than the mastery of all the philosophical complications which the human mind ever invented.*

*The doctrine of the Earth's rotundity and motion is now shown to be unconditionally false; and therefore the scriptures which assert the contrary, are, in their philosophical teachings at least, literally true. In practical science therefore, atheism and denial of scriptural authority have no foundation. If human theories are cast aside, and the facts of nature, and legitimate reasoning alone depended upon, it will be seen that religion and true philosophy are not antagonistic, and that the hopes which both encourage may be fully relied upon. To the religious mind this matter is most important, it is indeed no less than a sacred question, for it renders complete[183] the evidence that the Jewish and Christian scriptures are true, and must have been communicated to mankind by an anterior and supernal Being. For if after so many ages of mental struggling, of speculation and trial, and change and counterchange, we have at length discovered that all astronomical theories are false, that the Earth is a plane, and motionless, and that the various luminaries above it are lights only and not worlds; and that these very doctrines have been taught and recorded in a work which has been handed down to us from the earliest times; from a time, in fact, when mankind could not have had sufficient experience to enable them to criticise and doubt, much less to invent, it follows that whoever dictated and caused such doctrines to be recorded and preserved to all future generations, must have been superhuman, omniscient, and, to the Earth and its inhabitants pre-existent.*

*To the dogged Atheist, whose "mind is made up" not to enter into any further investigation, and not to admit of possible error in his past conclusions, this question is*

*of no more account than it is to an Ox. He who cares not to re-examine from time to time his state of mind, and the result of his accumulated experience is in no single respect better than the lowest animal in creation. He may see nothing higher,[184] more noble, more intelligent or beautiful than himself; and in this his pride, conceit, and vanity find an incarnation. To such a creature there is no God, for he is himself an equal with the highest being he has ever recognised! Such Atheism exists to an alarming extent among the philosophers of Europe and America; and it has been mainly fostered by the astronomical and geological theories of the day. Besides which, in consequence of the differences between the language of Scripture and the teachings of modern Astronomy, there is to be found in the very hearts of Christian and Jewish congregations a sort of "smouldering scepticism;" kind of faint suspicion which causes great numbers to manifest a cold and visible indifference to religious requirements. It is this which has led thousands to desert the cause of earnest, active Christianity, and which has forced the majority of those who still remain in the ranks of religion to declare "that the Scriptures were not intended to teach correctly other than moral and religious doctrines; that the references so often made to the physical world, and to natural phenomena generally, are given in language to suit the prevailing notions and the ignorance of the people." A Christian philosopher who wrote almost a century ago in reference to remarks similar to the above, says, "Why should we suspect that[185] Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, and the later prophets and inspired writers have counterfeited their sentiments concerning the order of the universe, from pure complaisance, or being in any way obliged to dissemble with a view to gratify the prepossessions of the populace? These eminent men being kings, lawgivers, and generals themselves, or always privileged with access to the courts of sovereign princes, besides the reverence and awful dignity which the power of divination and working of miracles procured to them, had great worldly and spiritual authority... They had often in charge to command, suspend, revert, and otherwise interfere with the course and laws of nature, and were never daunted to speak out the truth before the most mighty potentates on earth, much less would they be overawed by the vox populi." To say that the Scriptures were not intended to teach science truthfully, is in substance to declare that God himself has stated, and commissioned His prophets to teach things which are utterly false! Those Newtonian philosophers who still hold that the sacred volume is the Word of God, are thus placed in a fearful dilemma. How can the two systems, so directly opposite in character, be reconciled? Oil and water alone will not combine—mix them by violence as we may, they will again separate when allowed to rest. Call[186] oil oil, and water water, and acknowledge them to be distinct in nature and value; but let no "hodge-podge" be attempted, and passed off as a genuine compound of oil and water. Call Scripture the Word of God—the Creator and Ruler of all things, and the*

*Fountain of all Truth; and call the Newtonian or Copernican Astronomy the word and work of man, of man, too, in his vainest mood—so vain and conceited as not to be content with the direct and simple teachings of his Maker, but who must rise up in rebellion and conjure into existence a fanciful complicated fabric, which being insisted upon as true, creates and necessitates the dark and horrible interrogatives—Is God a deceiver? Has He spoken direct and unequivocal falsehood? Can we no longer indulge in the beautiful and consoling thought that God’s justice, and love, and truth are unchanging and reliable for ever? Let Christians—for Sceptics and Atheists may be left out of the question—to whatever division of the [Church] they belong, look at this matter calmly and earnestly. Let them determine to uproot the deception which has led them to think that they can altogether ignore the plainest astronomical teaching of Scripture, and endorse a system to which it is in every sense opposed. The following language is quoted as an instance of the manner in which the doctrine of the[187] Earth’s rotundity and the plurality of worlds interferes with Scriptural teachings:—“The theory of original sin is confuted (by our astronomical and geological knowledge), and I cannot permit the belief, when I know that our world is but a mere speck, a perishable atom in the vast space of creation, that God should just select this little spot to descend upon and assume our form, and clothe Himself in our flesh, to become visible to human eyes, to the tiny beings of this comparatively insignificant world.... Thus millions of distant worlds, with the beings allotted to them, were to be extirpated and destroyed in consequence of the original sin of Adam. No sentiment of the human mind can surely be more derogatory to the Divine attributes of the Creator, nor more repugnant to the known economy of the celestial bodies. For in the first place, who is to say, among the infinity of worlds, whether Adam was the only creature who was tempted by Satan and fell, and by his fall involved all the other worlds in his guilt.”[42] End quote.*

That statement was taken from the Universal dictionary of arts, sciences, and literature v.16 (1819). Rowbotham continues.

[42]Encyclopædia Londenensis, p. 457, vol. 2.

*The difficulty experienced by the author of the above remarks is clearly one which can no longer exist, when it is seen that the doctrine of a plurality of worlds is an impossibility. That it is an impossibility is shown by the fact that the Sun, Moon, and Stars are very small bodies,[188] and very near to the earth; this fact is proved by actual non-theoretical measurement; this measurement is made on the principle of plane trigonometry: this principle of plane trigonometry is adopted because the Earth is a Plane; and all the base lines employed in the triangulation are horizontal. By the same*



*practical method of reasoning, all the difficulties which, upon geological and astronomical grounds, have been raised to the literal teachings of the scriptures, may be completely destroyed. Instances:—The scriptures repeatedly declare that the Sun moves over the Earth—“His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it.” “He ariseth and goeth down, and hasteth to his place whence he arose.” “The sun stood still in the midst of heaven.” “Great is the Earth, high is the heaven, swift is the Sun in his course.” In the religious poems of all ages the same fact is presented. Christians especially, of every denomination, are familiar with, and often read and sing with delight such poetry as the following:—*

*“My God who makes the Sun to know  
His proper hour to rise,  
And to give light to all below  
Doth send him round the skies.”  
“When from the chambers of the east  
His morning race begins,  
He never tires nor stops to rest,  
But round the world he shines.” [189]  
“God of the morning, at whose voice,  
The cheerful sun makes haste to rise,  
And, like a giant, doth rejoice,  
To run his journey through the skies.”  
“He sends the sun his circuit round,  
To cheer the fruits and warm the ground.”  
“How fair has the day been!  
How bright was the Sun!  
How lovely and joyful  
The course that he run.”*

*All the expressions of scripture are consistent with the fact of the Sun’s motion. They never declare anything to the contrary. Whenever they speak of the subject it is in the same manner. The direct evidence of our senses confirms it; and actual and special observations, as well as the most practical scientific experiments, declare the same thing. The progressive and concentric motion of the Sun over the Earth is in every sense demonstrable; yet the Newtonian astronomers insist upon it that the Sun does not really move, that it only appears to move, and that this appearance arises from the motion of the Earth; that when, as the scriptures affirm, the “Sun stood still in the midst of heaven,” it was the Earth which stood still and not the Sun! that the scriptures*

*therefore speak falsely, and the experiments of science, and the observations and applications of our senses are never to be relied upon. Whence comes this bold and arrogant denial of the value of our senses and judgement,[190] and the authority of scripture? The Earth or the Sun moves. Our senses tell us, and the scriptures declare that the Earth is fixed and that it is the Sun which moves above and around it; but a theory, which is absolutely false in its groundwork, and ridiculously illogical in its details, demands that the Earth is round and moves upon axes, and in several other and various directions; and that these motions are sufficient to account for certain phenomena without supposing that the Sun moves, therefore the Sun is a fixed body, and his motion is only apparent! Such reasoning is a disgrace to philosophy, and fearfully dangerous to the religious interests of humanity!*

*Christian ministers and commentators find it a most unwelcome task when called upon to reconcile the plain and simple philosophy of the scriptures with the monstrous teachings of theoretical astronomy. Dr. Adam Clark, in a letter to the Rev. Thomas Roberts, of Bath,[43] speaking of the progress of his commentary, and of his endeavours to reconcile the statements of scripture with the modern astronomy, says: "Joshua's Sun and Moon standing still, have kept me going for nearly three weeks! That one chapter has afforded me more vexation than anything I have ever met with; and even now I am but[191] about half satisfied with my own solution of all the difficulties, though I am confident that I have removed mountains that were never touched before; shall I say that I am heartily weary of my work, so weary that I have a thousand times wished I had never written one page of it, and am repeatedly purposing to give it up."*

[43]Life of Adam Clark, 8vo Edition.

*The Rev. John Wesley, in his journal, writes as follows:—"The more I consider them the more I doubt of all systems of astronomy. I doubt whether we can with certainty know either the distance or magnitude of any star in the firmament; else why do astronomers so immensely differ, even with regard to the distance of the Sun from the Earth? Some affirming it to be only three and others ninety millions of miles."*[44]

[44]Extracts from works of Rev. J. Wesley, 3rd Edition, 1829. Published by Mason, London, p. 392, vol. 2.

*In vol. 3, page 203, the following entry occurs:—"January 1st, 1765.—This week I wrote an answer to a warm letter published in the London Magazine, the author whereof is much displeased that I presume to doubt of the 'modern astronomy.' I cannot help it.*

*Nay, the more I consider the more my doubts increase; so that at present I doubt whether any man on earth knows either the distance or magnitude, I will not say of a fixed Star, but Saturn or Jupiter—yea of the Sun or Moon.”*

I'm out of time. I want so much to continue. This is some of the most awesome reading I've ever done in my life. I want you to know this, before I started this series, In the Beginning, I never read what Samuel Rowbotham wrote. I did not formulate any of my beliefs for this series from anything he wrote. But I am truly amazed at how much I am in agreement with what he said, what he wrote - more than 100 years ago. Obviously, I'm not finishing this today. I intend to pick right back up here next week.